

**Corrections Standards Authority (CSA)  
SB 81 Local Youthful Offender Rehabilitative Facility  
Construction Funding Program  
Executive Steering Committee**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**COMMITTEE CHAIRS:**

**Linda Penner**, Chair  
Fresno County Chief Probation Officer  
CSA Board Member  
**Adele Arnold**, Co-chair  
Siskiyou County Chief Probation Officer  
CSA Board Member  
**Carol Biondi**, Co-chair  
CSA Board Member, Public Member

**LOCATION:**

Corrections Standards Authority  
660 Bercut Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95811

**TIME CONVENED:**

June 9, 10:00 am

**TIME ADJOURNED:**

June 9, 11:25 am

**PRESENT:**

**Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Members:**

**John Roberts**, Kern County Chief Probation Officer; **Doug Carver**, Nevada County Chief Probation Officer; **Mike Nelson**, Merced County Board of Supervisors; **Tom Mitchell**, Mendocino County Executive Officer; **Sue Burrell**, Staff Attorney, Youth Law Center; **Scott Crane**, Youth Member; **Geoff Henderson**, Senior Program Director, Phoenix House, Orange County; **Tom Bosenko**, Shasta County Sheriff; and **Kim Barrett**, San Luis Obispo County Chief Probation Officer

**Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) Staff:**

**C. Scott Harris**, Executive Director; **Bob Takeshta**, Deputy Director; **Leslie Heller**, Field Representative; **Charlene Aboytes**, Field Representative; **Melinda Ciarabellini**, Field Representative; **John Kohls**, PhD., Corrections Consultant; and **John Berner**, PhD., Corrections Consultant

**ABSENT:** **Colleene Preciado**, Orange County Chief Probation Officer; **Perry Reniff**, Butte County Sheriff; **Don Kingdon**, Ph.D., California Mental Health Directors Association

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:** **Charlene Aboytes**, CSA Field Representative

## **I. Welcome and Introductions**

**Committee Chair, Linda Penner** welcomed the group and began the meeting with introductions of the ESC members and staff.

## **II. Goals of Today's Meeting/Revisions to draft Request for Proposals (RFP)**

Field Representative **Charlene Aboytes** discussed the goals of the meeting. She reminded the group that this ESC met on February 19, 2008 to develop the components of the draft RFP and the rating criteria and factors that will be used to rate and rank county's proposals upon submission to the CSA. The draft RFP that resulted from that meeting was sent to each of the ESC members, the Governor's Office, the Office of the Attorney General, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Office of Legal Affairs and the State Public Works Board for review and comment. The draft RFP was modified to incorporate many of those changes. The purpose to today's meeting was to inform the ESC of those changes and to discuss a revised timeline for the process.

**Sue Burrell** asked about the status of her previous question regarding whether the ESC had the authority to narrow the scope of the language in the legislation (Section 1971) that indicates that the funds through this construction program can be used to "...acquire, design, renovate, or construct a youthful offender rehabilitative facility..." (At the first ESC meeting the committee decided to allow state dollars to reimburse counties for construction costs only.) **Mike Davis**, Senior Staff Counsel, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Office of Legal Affairs opined that because of the use of the word **or**, statute does not require that each of the above options be exercised. **Mr. Davis** indicated that the legislative language provides the option of either acquiring, designing, renovating **or** constructing. He indicated that the CSA does have the discretion to allow that funds be used only for construction.

CSA staff reminded the group that all counties are required to commit to providing a minimum of 25 percent of total eligible project costs as matching funds and that site acquisition (in-kind) and design (hard match) are both eligible match costs.<sup>1</sup>

**Chair Linda Penner** asked the group for a vote to keep the language in the RFP that indicates that the state funds can only be used for facility construction, expansion or renovation. **Ms. Burrell** voted no; the remainder of the ESC voted aye.

**Ms. Aboytes** indicated that the modifications to the draft RFP were generally non-substantive changes, but included a few substantive changes. She led the group through the draft RFP discussing the substantive changes.

---

<sup>1</sup> As outlined in the RFP, site acquisition and design can be claimed as match, as well as other project costs previously determined by CSA to be eligible match items. While it wasn't discussed at the ESC meeting, SB 81 allows counties with a general population of less than 200,000 to petition the CSA Board for a lower matching fund requirement.

During the review of the General Definitions section of the RFP, **Ms. Burrell** suggested that the term “non-secure bed/program space” (a newly added definition) should be added to the definition of “youthful offender rehabilitative facilities.” **Doug Carver** suggested the following: Youthful offender rehabilitative facilities are county-owned structures including non-secure bed/program space, meeting applicable Title 15 and Title 24 regulations in which county-operated programs take place for the purpose of the rehabilitation of youthful offenders.” The group agreed with this change.

The following changes to the proposal form were suggested by the ESC.

- Section 4: Narrative, subsection B.7, the term “your” was replaced by “the county’s”
- Section 5: Board of Supervisors’ Resolution, sixth bullet, remove unnecessary parenthesis
- Section 5: Board of Supervisors’ Resolution, eighth bullet, remove unnecessary parenthesis and verify that the page number is accurate
- Section 6: Proposal Checklist, subsection d, add a requirement that an electronic copy of the proposal must be provided via CD ROM
- Section 6: Proposal Checklist, subsection g, a 12-point font shall be used for the proposal and the appendices

**Mr. Carver** suggested that due to the delay in releasing the draft RFP to the field, the year to which counties may build to future capacity needs should be changed from 2012 to 2013. **Chair Linda Penner** asked the group for a vote on this issue. Carol Biondi voted no; the remainder of the ESC voted aye.

There was no public comment regarding the changes to the draft RFP.

### **Timeline Discussion**

**Ms. Aboytes** asked the group to look at the two timeline options offered as revisions to the previously approved timeline for this process. After a brief discussion **Chair Linda Penner** asked the group for a vote. The ESC unanimously voted to accept Option 2 (attached).

**Chair Linda Penner** thanked the committee members and staff. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:25 am.